

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH  
AT HYDERABAD**

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA**

-

**WRIT PETITION NO : 6791 of 2005**

Between:

Mandla Bayyanna, S/o. Bayyanna,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,  
  
Racheral Mandal, Prakasam District.

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

- 1 The Commissioner,  
  
Endowment Department,  
Hyderabad.
- 2 The Deputy Commissioner,  
  
Endowment Department,  
Guntur, Guntur District.
- 3 The Asst. Commissioner,  
  
Endowments Department,  
Ongole, Prakasam District.
- 4 The Executive Officer,  
  
Sri Nemaligundala Ranganayaka  
Swamy Temple,  
J.Puillalacheruvu Village,  
  
Racherla Mandal Prakasam District.
- 5 Kannasani Rangaiah, S/o. Subbaiah,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
6 Epuri Subbaiah, S/o.Chinna Veeraiah,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
7 Vellela Ranga Reddy, S/o.Seshi Reddy,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
8 Smt. Meeniga Bala Rajamma,

W/o.Pedda Balaiah  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
9 Kavadi Guruvaiah, S/o. Guruvaiah,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
10 Smt Pagidi Haritha,

W/o. Rainesh Babu Reddy,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.  
11 Paradeshi Chandra Sekhar,

W/o. Rainesh Babu Reddy,  
J.Pullalacheruvu Village, Racherla Mandal,  
Prakasam District.

#### **.....RESPONDENTS**

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ or Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus by declaring the action of the 1st respondent in appointing the respondents No.5 to 11 as festival committee, as illegal, arbitrary against the rules of Endowments Dept., and unconstitutional and consequently set aside the proceedings of the 1st respondent vide No.D.Dis.No.D2/7505/2005 dt.23.02.2005 and pass such other order or orders.

**Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.CHALLA.SRINIVASA REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.: GP FOR ENDOWMENTS**

**The Court at the admission stage made the following :**

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA**

-

**WRIT PETITION No.6791 of 2005**

-

**ORDER:-**

The writ petitioner challenges the proceedings dated 23-02-2005 passed by the Commissioner, Endowments Department, Hyderabad, in appointing a Festival Committee consisting of seven members, who are residents of J.Pullalacheruvu village.

It appears that the festival by name "TIRUNALU UTSAVAM" is going to be held in the month of April 2005. It further appears that there is a Trust Board appointed by the Deputy Commissioner, Endowments Department (R-2). The term of the office would expire by 17-04-2005.

When actually the festival would commence and ends is not known, nor the counsel for the petitioner is able to say something in this regard. Therefore, it appears that in order to conduct the festival peacefully without giving any room for any complaint from any corner, the Festival Committee is appointed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the appointment of the said 'Festival Committee' is contrary to law and the Commissioner of Endowments has no authority to appoint a Festival Committee.

In this regard, it is to be noted that this Committee is not a Board. In other words, the Committee which is meant for conducting ensuing "TIRUNALU USTAVAM" in the month of April, 2005, cannot be equated with the Trust Board in general, which would deal with all the aspects including the day to day affairs of the Temple and whereas, the appointment of the Festival Committee obviously is only to coordinate with the Trust Board for the purpose of Festival by name "TIRUNALU USTAVAM". The moment the Ustavam (Festival) is completed, the committee would vanish automatically, though it is not made clear in the impugned order.

Furthermore, the most important aspect to be considered is that the petitioner is one among the members of the Trust Board and it is not the Trust Board that is aggrieved by the impugned order. Even, if the Board, as such is aggrieved by the impugned order, the writ petition should have been filed only with the proper authorization. A member of the Board like the petitioner cannot file the writ petition without any proper and valid authorization, as admittedly, the Board is not an aggrieved party. On this ground i.e., on the ground of *locus standi*, the writ petition is liable to be and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

---

30-03-2005

Prv

To

1 The Commissioner,

Endowment Department,  
Hyderabad.

2 The Deputy Commissioner,

Endowment Department,  
Guntur, Guntur District.

3 The Asst. Commissioner,

Endowments Department,  
Ongole, Prakasam District.

4 The Executive Officer,

Sri Nemaligundala Ranganayaka

Swamy Temple,  
J.Puillalacheruvu Village,

Racherla Mandal Prakasam District.  
5 Two CCs to G.P. for Endowments,

A.P.High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad (OUT).

6 Two CD copies.